

FAIR

This Is  
A World of Wants

Weather  
Indica-  
tions.

Weather  
Indica-  
tions.

Through Wants  
In The World.

PRICE ONE CENT.

FAIR

There Is  
A World for Wants

Weather  
Indica-  
tions.

Weather  
Indica-  
tions.

A World of  
Wants In It.

PRICE ONE CENT.

# WORLD'S TWO AND THREE TIME RATE.

**EXTRA.**  
2 O'CLOCK.  
**MILLIONAIRE AT BAR.**

**Crowds at the Trial of the  
Langley Divorce Suit.**

**United States Hotel Employees  
Identify Him as a Frequent Guest.**

**Mrs. Langley Makes Serious Charges  
Against the Clubman.**

The spectacle of a millionaire on trial, on charges of being unfaithful to his marriage vows, was a potent attraction this morning in the Supreme Court, Brooklyn, where Justice Landon and a jury are hearing testimony in the suit for absolute divorce brought by Mrs. Belle Langley against William H. Langley.

A crowd gathered outside the court-room long before 9:30 o'clock, and when the doors were opened there was a wild scramble for seats. Among the interested spectators were several members of the Brooklyn Club, who came to hear the evidence against their fellow-member. Langley was not in court when the proceedings began.

Only three witnesses were examined yesterday. They told a plausible story, which was not shaken by Lawyer Parsons's searching cross-examination. What Mrs. Langley's defense will be was a subject of much discussion this morning. It is thought by many persons that Langley's lawyers will try to establish an alibi. Others think that an attempt will be made to bring ex-Corporation Counsel William C. De Witt, of Brooklyn, into the matter, as the counsel for Langley questioned each juror particularly as to whether he knew Mr. De Witt, who had read of his relations with the Langley household.

Mrs. Langley and her sister came into court promptly at 10 o'clock. They were accompanied by ex-Judge Reynolds and Margaret O'Shady, a motherly-looking woman dressed in mourning, who was yesterday mistaken for Mrs. Langley's mother.

Mrs. O'Shady continued her testimony this morning from the stand where she was yesterday broken off last night. She was formerly a chambermaid at the United States Hotel, in New York. She is now "patron" lady at Miss Elly's fashionable girls' school on Riverside drive.

Mrs. O'Shady was cross-examined by Lawyer Parsons. She testified that she had seen Mr. G. L. Shepard, Mrs. Langley's father, at his house at Irvington.

Q. You spoke of a person yesterday whom you said had a red face. Was it Mr. Langley?

A. Yes, sir. When did Mrs. Langley tell you that he had a red face. Was it on Christmas day?

A. I am not certain. It may have been about ten days ago.

Witness said she had been at the hotel about fifteen minutes when she saw Mr. Langley, who was with her, and a clerk, were there at the time. The first she had heard of the Langley suit was when her brother called at Miss Elly's school the Thursday before last Christmas.

Lawyer T. H. H. Face.

On redirect examination Mrs. O'Shady said she had seen Mrs. Langley at her husband's house at Irvington.

Arthur Wells, a bellboy at the United States Hotel, was recalled to the stand by Mr. Parsons.

Q. Do you recognize this gentleman (pointing to a man in the audience)? A. That is Mr. Williams, formerly night clerk.

Q. Did you ever tell Mr. Williams that you knew where you could get money? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you ever tell Mr. Williams that you had money, or could get money, from Mrs. Langley's side of the case? A. No, sir; I don't know.

Q. Did you ever tell them about playing billiards with a man who dropped a five or a ten on the floor?

Alice J. Shepard, Mrs. Langley's sister, was called to the stand by Mr. Parsons.

Q. Did you ever tell them that this man was the man who had been at the United States Hotel?

A. Yes, sir. I saw him at the hotel, and I saw him at Mrs. Langley's house, and I saw him at the United States Hotel.

Q. Were you on the street yesterday when you saw him?

A. Yes, sir. I saw him at the hotel, and I saw him at Mrs. Langley's house, and I saw him at the United States Hotel.

Q. Did you ever tell them that this man was the man who had been at the United States Hotel?

A. Yes, sir. I saw him at the hotel, and I saw him at Mrs. Langley's house, and I saw him at the United States Hotel.

Q. Did you ever tell them that this man was the man who had been at the United States Hotel?

A. Yes, sir. I saw him at the hotel, and I saw him at Mrs. Langley's house, and I saw him at the United States Hotel.

**POINTERS ON THE RACES.**  
Looks Like a Soft Thing for the Favorites on To-Day's Card.

**Second Race Is the Star Event—Woodchopper May Get It.**

Favorites look to have the majority of the races at the Metropolitan track today. Woodchopper looks to have an easy thing in the third. Panway looks to have a cake walk in the fourth, and Uncertainty and Extra also look easy winners.

Racing is uncertain, however, and no one can tell how things will turn out. Jack Rose, the surest kind of a sure thing a few days ago, but today's card is a different matter.

The second race—Woodchopper, Innovation, Duke John, Blackburne and Lucy Clark—ought to furnish the most interesting contest of the day. The track will be hard and fast, but the odds and selections, together with the odds against the pool-rooms this morning, will be found below:

First Race—Purse \$400, of which \$50 to second. Favorites: 1. Woodchopper, 2. Innovation, 3. Duke John, 4. Blackburne, 5. Lucy Clark.

Second Race—Purse \$400, of which \$50 to second. Favorites: 1. Woodchopper, 2. Innovation, 3. Duke John, 4. Blackburne, 5. Lucy Clark.

Third Race—Purse \$400, of which \$50 to second. Favorites: 1. Woodchopper, 2. Innovation, 3. Duke John, 4. Blackburne, 5. Lucy Clark.

Fourth Race—Purse \$400, of which \$50 to second. Favorites: 1. Woodchopper, 2. Innovation, 3. Duke John, 4. Blackburne, 5. Lucy Clark.

Fifth Race—Purse \$400, of which \$50 to second. Favorites: 1. Woodchopper, 2. Innovation, 3. Duke John, 4. Blackburne, 5. Lucy Clark.

Sixth Race—Purse \$400, of which \$50 to second. Favorites: 1. Woodchopper, 2. Innovation, 3. Duke John, 4. Blackburne, 5. Lucy Clark.

Seventh Race—Purse \$400, of which \$50 to second. Favorites: 1. Woodchopper, 2. Innovation, 3. Duke John, 4. Blackburne, 5. Lucy Clark.

Eighth Race—Purse \$400, of which \$50 to second. Favorites: 1. Woodchopper, 2. Innovation, 3. Duke John, 4. Blackburne, 5. Lucy Clark.

Ninth Race—Purse \$400, of which \$50 to second. Favorites: 1. Woodchopper, 2. Innovation, 3. Duke John, 4. Blackburne, 5. Lucy Clark.

Tenth Race—Purse \$400, of which \$50 to second. Favorites: 1. Woodchopper, 2. Innovation, 3. Duke John, 4. Blackburne, 5. Lucy Clark.

Eleventh Race—Purse \$400, of which \$50 to second. Favorites: 1. Woodchopper, 2. Innovation, 3. Duke John, 4. Blackburne, 5. Lucy Clark.

Twelfth Race—Purse \$400, of which \$50 to second. Favorites: 1. Woodchopper, 2. Innovation, 3. Duke John, 4. Blackburne, 5. Lucy Clark.

Thirteenth Race—Purse \$400, of which \$50 to second. Favorites: 1. Woodchopper, 2. Innovation, 3. Duke John, 4. Blackburne, 5. Lucy Clark.

Fourteenth Race—Purse \$400, of which \$50 to second. Favorites: 1. Woodchopper, 2. Innovation, 3. Duke John, 4. Blackburne, 5. Lucy Clark.

Fifteenth Race—Purse \$400, of which \$50 to second. Favorites: 1. Woodchopper, 2. Innovation, 3. Duke John, 4. Blackburne, 5. Lucy Clark.

Sixteenth Race—Purse \$400, of which \$50 to second. Favorites: 1. Woodchopper, 2. Innovation, 3. Duke John, 4. Blackburne, 5. Lucy Clark.

Seventeenth Race—Purse \$400, of which \$50 to second. Favorites: 1. Woodchopper, 2. Innovation, 3. Duke John, 4. Blackburne, 5. Lucy Clark.

Eighteenth Race—Purse \$400, of which \$50 to second. Favorites: 1. Woodchopper, 2. Innovation, 3. Duke John, 4. Blackburne, 5. Lucy Clark.

Nineteenth Race—Purse \$400, of which \$50 to second. Favorites: 1. Woodchopper, 2. Innovation, 3. Duke John, 4. Blackburne, 5. Lucy Clark.

Twentieth Race—Purse \$400, of which \$50 to second. Favorites: 1. Woodchopper, 2. Innovation, 3. Duke John, 4. Blackburne, 5. Lucy Clark.

Twenty-first Race—Purse \$400, of which \$50 to second. Favorites: 1. Woodchopper, 2. Innovation, 3. Duke John, 4. Blackburne, 5. Lucy Clark.

Twenty-second Race—Purse \$400, of which \$50 to second. Favorites: 1. Woodchopper, 2. Innovation, 3. Duke John, 4. Blackburne, 5. Lucy Clark.

Twenty-third Race—Purse \$400, of which \$50 to second. Favorites: 1. Woodchopper, 2. Innovation, 3. Duke John, 4. Blackburne, 5. Lucy Clark.

Twenty-fourth Race—Purse \$400, of which \$50 to second. Favorites: 1. Woodchopper, 2. Innovation, 3. Duke John, 4. Blackburne, 5. Lucy Clark.

Twenty-fifth Race—Purse \$400, of which \$50 to second. Favorites: 1. Woodchopper, 2. Innovation, 3. Duke John, 4. Blackburne, 5. Lucy Clark.

Twenty-sixth Race—Purse \$400, of which \$50 to second. Favorites: 1. Woodchopper, 2. Innovation, 3. Duke John, 4. Blackburne, 5. Lucy Clark.

Twenty-seventh Race—Purse \$400, of which \$50 to second. Favorites: 1. Woodchopper, 2. Innovation, 3. Duke John, 4. Blackburne, 5. Lucy Clark.

Twenty-eighth Race—Purse \$400, of which \$50 to second. Favorites: 1. Woodchopper, 2. Innovation, 3. Duke John, 4. Blackburne, 5. Lucy Clark.

Twenty-ninth Race—Purse \$400, of which \$50 to second. Favorites: 1. Woodchopper, 2. Innovation, 3. Duke John, 4. Blackburne, 5. Lucy Clark.

Thirtieth Race—Purse \$400, of which \$50 to second. Favorites: 1. Woodchopper, 2. Innovation, 3. Duke John, 4. Blackburne, 5. Lucy Clark.

Thirty-first Race—Purse \$400, of which \$50 to second. Favorites: 1. Woodchopper, 2. Innovation, 3. Duke John, 4. Blackburne, 5. Lucy Clark.

Thirty-second Race—Purse \$400, of which \$50 to second. Favorites: 1. Woodchopper, 2. Innovation, 3. Duke John, 4. Blackburne, 5. Lucy Clark.

Thirty-third Race—Purse \$400, of which \$50 to second. Favorites: 1. Woodchopper, 2. Innovation, 3. Duke John, 4. Blackburne, 5. Lucy Clark.

**SINCLAIR WILL PLEAD GUILTY.**  
Armour's Defaulting Cashier Arraigned and Held.

**\$8,000 of the Stolen Money Attached in Philadelphia.**

Charles S. Sinclair, the defaulting cashier of the New York branch of the Armour Packing Company, was arraigned before Justice Smith, in the Tombs Police Court, this morning, and held in \$8,000 bail for the Grand Jury.

Sinclair had been in the employ of the company for several years, in the capacity of bookkeeper and cashier. He was married, and lived with his wife and three children at 43 West One Hundred and Twenty-sixth street.

He had, so far as his employers knew, no bad habits. He did not use tobacco in any form, never frequented saloons, was punctual at his desk, and was an expert accountant.

On Nov. 17 last, Sinclair failed to put in his appearance at the office, and it became known that he had fled the city and was a defaulter.

The aggregate of his pecuniary assets as ascertained by experts called in to make an examination of the books was \$18,000. The day of his departure he took \$7,000 in cash and the remainder was taken in small sums during a period of a year, accounts being falsified to cover the delinquency.

Sinclair had been vouchered for by the American Guaranty and Surety Company, New York, and also by the Missouri, Kansas and Texas Trust Company, of Kansas City, Mo. As the loss would fall on these two companies, they exerted themselves to find the missing cashier.

Clinton T. Linton, special agent and New York representative of both companies, faced Sinclair to Philadelphia, and to various other places, finally confronting him in Chicago.

Sinclair was induced to return to New York with the agent without requisition papers and arrived in Jersey City Saturday night. He was taken to the Central Office of Detectives, Rogers and Kosh, where he was held in custody.

There were two complaints against him. One was for the larceny of \$65,000, and the other for the larceny of a similar amount, and a prior conviction of a similar offense.

Lawyer John C. Munzinger appeared for Sinclair, and stated that he had been indicted for the larceny of \$65,000, and that he had been indicted for the larceny of a similar amount, and a prior conviction of a similar offense.

He stated that Sinclair would probably be indicted for forgery in the New York case, and that he had been indicted for the larceny of \$65,000, and that he had been indicted for the larceny of a similar amount, and a prior conviction of a similar offense.

He stated that Sinclair would probably be indicted for forgery in the New York case, and that he had been indicted for the larceny of \$65,000, and that he had been indicted for the larceny of a similar amount, and a prior conviction of a similar offense.

He stated that Sinclair would probably be indicted for forgery in the New York case, and that he had been indicted for the larceny of \$65,000, and that he had been indicted for the larceny of a similar amount, and a prior conviction of a similar offense.

He stated that Sinclair would probably be indicted for forgery in the New York case, and that he had been indicted for the larceny of \$65,000, and that he had been indicted for the larceny of a similar amount, and a prior conviction of a similar offense.

He stated that Sinclair would probably be indicted for forgery in the New York case, and that he had been indicted for the larceny of \$65,000, and that he had been indicted for the larceny of a similar amount, and a prior conviction of a similar offense.

He stated that Sinclair would probably be indicted for forgery in the New York case, and that he had been indicted for the larceny of \$65,000, and that he had been indicted for the larceny of a similar amount, and a prior conviction of a similar offense.

He stated that Sinclair would probably be indicted for forgery in the New York case, and that he had been indicted for the larceny of \$65,000, and that he had been indicted for the larceny of a similar amount, and a prior conviction of a similar offense.

He stated that Sinclair would probably be indicted for forgery in the New York case, and that he had been indicted for the larceny of \$65,000, and that he had been indicted for the larceny of a similar amount, and a prior conviction of a similar offense.

He stated that Sinclair would probably be indicted for forgery in the New York case, and that he had been indicted for the larceny of \$65,000, and that he had been indicted for the larceny of a similar amount, and a prior conviction of a similar offense.

He stated that Sinclair would probably be indicted for forgery in the New York case, and that he had been indicted for the larceny of \$65,000, and that he had been indicted for the larceny of a similar amount, and a prior conviction of a similar offense.

He stated that Sinclair would probably be indicted for forgery in the New York case, and that he had been indicted for the larceny of \$65,000, and that he had been indicted for the larceny of a similar amount, and a prior conviction of a similar offense.

He stated that Sinclair would probably be indicted for forgery in the New York case, and that he had been indicted for the larceny of \$65,000, and that he had been indicted for the larceny of a similar amount, and a prior conviction of a similar offense.

He stated that Sinclair would probably be indicted for forgery in the New York case, and that he had been indicted for the larceny of \$65,000, and that he had been indicted for the larceny of a similar amount, and a prior conviction of a similar offense.

He stated that Sinclair would probably be indicted for forgery in the New York case, and that he had been indicted for the larceny of \$65,000, and that he had been indicted for the larceny of a similar amount, and a prior conviction of a similar offense.

He stated that Sinclair would probably be indicted for forgery in the New York case, and that he had been indicted for the larceny of \$65,000, and that he had been indicted for the larceny of a similar amount, and a prior conviction of a similar offense.

He stated that Sinclair would probably be indicted for forgery in the New York case, and that he had been indicted for the larceny of \$65,000, and that he had been indicted for the larceny of a similar amount, and a prior conviction of a similar offense.

He stated that Sinclair would probably be indicted for forgery in the New York case, and that he had been indicted for the larceny of \$65,000, and that he had been indicted for the larceny of a similar amount, and a prior conviction of a similar offense.

He stated that Sinclair would probably be indicted for forgery in the New York case, and that he had been indicted for the larceny of \$65,000, and that he had been indicted for the larceny of a similar amount, and a prior conviction of a similar offense.

He stated that Sinclair would probably be indicted for forgery in the New York case, and that he had been indicted for the larceny of \$65,000, and that he had been indicted for the larceny of a similar amount, and a prior conviction of a similar offense.

He stated that Sinclair would probably be indicted for forgery in the New York case, and that he had been indicted for the larceny of \$65,000, and that he had been indicted for the larceny of a similar amount, and a prior conviction of a similar offense.

He stated that Sinclair would probably be indicted for forgery in the New York case, and that he had been indicted for the larceny of \$65,000, and that he had been indicted for the larceny of a similar amount, and a prior conviction of a similar offense.

He stated that Sinclair would probably be indicted for forgery in the New York case, and that he had been indicted for the larceny of \$65,000, and that he had been indicted for the larceny of a similar amount, and a prior conviction of a similar offense.

He stated that Sinclair would probably be indicted for forgery in the New York case, and that he had been indicted for the larceny of \$65,000, and that he had been indicted for the larceny of a similar amount, and a prior conviction of a similar offense.

He stated that Sinclair would probably be indicted for forgery in the New York case, and that he had been indicted for the larceny of \$65,000, and that he had been indicted for the larceny of a similar amount, and a prior conviction of a similar offense.

He stated that Sinclair would probably be indicted for forgery in the New York case, and that he had been indicted for the larceny of \$65,000, and that he had been indicted for the larceny of a similar amount, and a prior conviction of a similar offense.

He stated that Sinclair would probably be indicted for forgery in the New York case, and that he had been indicted for the larceny of \$65,000, and that he had been indicted for the larceny of a similar amount, and a prior conviction of a similar offense.

**BILLY M'GLORY IS A PAUPER.**  
He Says So, on His Oath, in Judge McCarthy's Court.

**He Was Examined To-Day in Supplemental Proceedings.**

As a result of City Judge McCarthy's decision yesterday that he would otherwise have to go to jail for contempt, William Henry McGlory consented to appear in chambers this morning and be examined in supplemental proceedings as to his earthly belongings.

The proceedings are the result of a \$700,000 judgment secured against McGlory by S. J. Lannan & Co., of Baltimore, for liquor, purchased by McGlory when he was running his palatial club at Irving place and Fortieth street, for which he recently finished serving a year's term in the penitentiary.

Lawyer Kohn, of Kohn, Buck & Lippman, his counsel, accompanied McGlory to court this morning. He wore a shiny suit hat, with blue overcoat and black silk number with red pinstripes, and was as genteel-looking a pauper as is often seen.

Neither were there visible signs of the illness which was the wily developer's excuse for delay in responding to the court's order.

Judge McCarthy administered the oath to McGlory, and with his attorney and Lawyer David Lovett, counsel for Lannan & Co., he went up into the jury room to be examined. During his examination he kept his head bowed.

As usual, McGlory swore that his name was McGlory, not McGlory, and that he was a pauper, and that he had no earthly belongings except that which was in the Irving place resort or hotel, as he called it, which the "hotel" was, he said, a building which he had bought for \$700,000.

This is interesting because it was developed on McGlory's part that he had nearly trumped the life out of poor Kohn, as well as assumed the direct management of the establishment.

Kohn's partner, McGlory, said he was a pauper, and that he had no earthly belongings except that which was in the Irving place resort or hotel, as he called it, which the "hotel" was, he said, a building which he had bought for \$700,000.

This is interesting because it was developed on McGlory's part that he had nearly trumped the life out of poor Kohn, as well as assumed the direct management of the establishment.

Kohn's partner, McGlory, said he was a pauper, and that he had no earthly belongings except that which was in the Irving place resort or hotel, as he called it, which the "hotel" was, he said, a building which he had bought for \$700,000.

This is interesting because it was developed on McGlory's part that he had nearly trumped the life out of poor Kohn, as well as assumed the direct management of the establishment.

Kohn's partner, McGlory, said he was a pauper, and that he had no earthly belongings except that which was in the Irving place resort or hotel, as he called it, which the "hotel" was, he said, a building which he had bought for \$700,000.

This is interesting because it was developed on McGlory's part that he had nearly trumped the life out of poor Kohn, as well as assumed the direct management of the establishment.

Kohn's partner, McGlory, said he was a pauper, and that he had no earthly belongings except that which was in the Irving place resort or hotel, as he called it, which the "hotel" was, he said, a building which he had bought for \$700,000.

This is interesting because it was developed on McGlory's part that he had nearly trumped the life out of poor Kohn, as well as assumed the direct management of the establishment.

Kohn's partner, McGlory, said he was a pauper, and that he had no earthly belongings except that which was in the Irving place resort or hotel, as he called it, which the "hotel" was, he said, a building which he had bought for \$700,000.

This is interesting because it was developed on McGlory's part that he had nearly trumped the life out of poor Kohn, as well as assumed the direct management of the establishment.

Kohn's partner, McGlory, said he was a pauper, and that he had no earthly belongings except that which was in the Irving place resort or hotel, as he called it, which the "hotel" was, he said, a building which he had bought for \$700,000.

This is interesting because it was developed on McGlory's part that he had nearly trumped the life out of poor Kohn, as well as assumed the direct management of the establishment.

Kohn's partner, McGlory, said he was a pauper, and that he had no earthly belongings except that which was in the Irving place resort or hotel, as he called it, which the "hotel" was, he said, a building which he had bought for \$700,000.

This is interesting because it was developed on McGlory's part that he had nearly trumped the life out of poor Kohn, as well as assumed the direct management of the establishment.

Kohn's partner, McGlory, said he was a pauper, and that he had no earthly belongings except that which was in the Irving place resort or hotel, as he called it, which the "hotel" was, he said, a building which he had bought for \$700,000.

This is interesting because it was developed on McGlory's part that he had nearly trumped the life out of poor Kohn, as well as assumed the direct management of the establishment.

Kohn's partner, McGlory, said he was a pauper, and that he had no earthly belongings except that which was in the Irving place resort or hotel, as he called it, which the "hotel" was, he said, a building which he had bought for \$700,000.

This is interesting because it was developed on McGlory's part that he had nearly trumped the life out of poor Kohn, as well as assumed the direct management of the establishment.

Kohn's partner, McGlory, said he was a pauper, and that he had no earthly belongings except that which was in the Irving place resort or hotel, as he called it, which the "hotel" was, he said, a building which he had bought for \$700,000.

This is interesting because it was developed on McGlory's part that he had nearly trumped the life out of poor Kohn, as well as assumed the direct management of the establishment.

Kohn's partner, McGlory, said he was a pauper, and that he had no earthly belongings except that which was in the Irving place resort or hotel, as he called it, which the "hotel" was, he said, a building which he had bought for \$700,000.

This is interesting because it was developed on McGlory's part that he had nearly trumped the life out of poor Kohn, as well as assumed the direct management of the establishment.

Kohn's partner, McGlory, said he was a pauper, and that he had no earthly belongings except that which was in the Irving place resort or hotel, as he called it, which the "hotel" was, he said, a building which he had bought for \$700,000.

This is interesting because it was developed on McGlory's part that he had nearly trumped the life out of poor Kohn, as well as assumed the direct management of the establishment.

Kohn's partner, McGlory, said he was a pauper, and that he had no earthly belongings except that which was in the Irving place resort or hotel, as he called it, which the "hotel" was, he said, a building which he had bought for \$700,000.

This is interesting because it was developed on McGlory's part that he had nearly trumped the life out of poor Kohn, as well as assumed the direct management of the establishment.

Kohn's partner, McGlory, said he was a pauper, and that he had no earthly belongings except that which was in the Irving place resort or hotel, as he called it, which the "hotel" was, he said, a building which he had bought for \$700,000.

This is interesting because it was developed on McGlory's part that he had nearly trumped the life out of poor Kohn, as well as assumed the direct management of the establishment.

Kohn's partner, McGlory, said he was a pauper, and that he had no earthly belongings except that which was in the Irving place resort or hotel, as he called it, which the "hotel" was, he said, a building which he had bought for \$700,000.

**NOT WORRIED ABOUT EGYPT.**  
New Advice Say the Native Army Is Loyal to Britain.

**And Is a Revolt Should Come 15,000 British Troops Are Handy.**

LONDON, Jan. 24.—Some surprise was expressed yesterday at the news from Cairo that Lord Cromer had expressed himself confidently in regard to the prompt suppression of any Egyptian outbreak that might occur.

To-day's address to the ground for Lord Cromer's confidence. His lordship is assured of the entire loyalty of the native Egyptian army to the British cause, and with the British army of occupation co-operating with the native troops, it is believed that any attempt at insurrection will be promptly crushed.

A Cairo dispatch says that Lord Cromer called upon the Khedive this morning to inform him that the British cabinet had ordered an increase of the British garrison in Egypt.

The dispatch does not state how the Khedive received the news, but no doubt is felt that it had a profound impression in disposing any idea that Mr. Khedive intended to abandon Egypt.

Major Gen. Sir Francis Wallace Grenfell, of the Egyptian Army, who is now in London, was at the War Office to-day in consultation with the High Commissioner, Lord Cromer.

It is officially stated at the War Office that both Sir Francis Wallace Grenfell and Gen. Kitchener, the Commander of the Egyptian troops, are in guaranteeing the loyalty of the